



APPENDIX A

Background Documents

EFF/NRS Data Collection Project Timetable, 2000–2001

EFF Assessment Framework: Timetable for Processes and Products, 2000–2004

EFF Assessment Consortium Staff, Technical Advisory Group and Field Development Partners

Participant Responsibilities and Agreement Forms

Educational Functioning Level Descriptors, National Reporting System

EFF/NRS Data Collection Project Timetable 2000-01

DATE	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS
August 2000	Letters and applications sent to state directors	Ohio, Oregon, Maine, Tennessee and Washington committed funds and began to identify from 3 to 6 programs per state to participate.
September	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sites identified 2. State field assistants identified 3. Field site training schedule established 4. Training materials and data collection protocols prepared 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 20 sites, 20 administrators, 88 teachers 2. Maine: Janet Smith; Ohio: Kathy Petrek and Sharon Katterheinrich; Oregon: Joan Benz; Tennessee: Aaron Kohring; Washington: Joan Allen. 3. In-state training sessions scheduled for October and early November. 4. Guide to the EFF/NRS Data Collection Project prepared. Notebook included four chapters on developing and rating performance tasks and observing and documenting student performance; data reporting forms, worksheets and templates for rating tasks and performance.
October	<p>Five 2-day training sessions conducted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oct 9-11: Washington • Oct 11-13: Oregon • Oct 18-20: Ohio • Oct 24-26: Tennessee • Oct 31-Nov 2: Maine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In each state, participants included all site teachers and program administrators; representatives from state adult education agency staff. • Training was conducted by Peggy McGuire and Brenda Bell, with assistance from the state field assistant, following a common agenda that focused on constructing performance tasks, as the vehicle for observing and documenting student performance.
November	Data collection and technical assistance process started	Practitioner-researchers completed preliminary worksheets for performance tasks; submitted to field assistants for review; received feedback.
December	<p>Continued technical assistance</p> <p>End of 1st reporting period, December 31</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field assistants visited each site or held conference calls with the research team at each site. • First round of data reports on performance tasks submitted electronically. 128 reports received on 10 standards. 20 reports received from administrators, describing the impacts of participation in this project on the team and program at large.
January 2001	Data review	EFF Assessment Team met to review data reports; identify needed corrections to protocols; and plan national mid-course meeting content.
February	National mid-course meeting, February 4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 100 teachers, administrators and state agency staff met in Washington, DC for three days to examine data on performance tasks, refine criteria for well-structured tasks, and prepare for submitting data on learner performance. • Based on recommendations of participants, staff prepared a series of memos and revised the data collection form.

EFF/NRS Data Collection Project Timetable 2000-01

DATE	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS
February 2001, cont.	Technical assistance to the field assistants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff provided on-going education and technical assistants to the practitioners who are serving as field assistants. This process began in October and is on-going.
February-March	Observations of student performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using performance tasks developed specifically to allow observation of performance on a standard in relation to the four dimensions of performance, teachers began documenting student performance.** • Field assistants held regular telephone or in-person meetings with program teams.
April	1. In-state technical assistance meetings held 2. End of second reporting period	1. Prior to the end of the second reporting period, in-state joint meetings of all field sites were conducted by the field assistants, with participation by McGuire or Bell, to provide additional technical assistance and clarification on reporting procedures. 2. From mid April to the end of the month, the second round of reports were submitted, accompanied by artifacts showing evidence of student performance. 110 data reports received. (Several teachers have either moved or not involved due to health or life changes).
April-May	Technical assistance continued	Project staff and technical advisors began a series of data review telephone conferences, to identify strengths and potential problems in the data, and to provide guidance to field assistants in giving feedback to practitioner-researchers. Regular telephone conferences with field assistants were held, to review the same data sets. Field assistants held regular telephone or in-person visits with field site teams.
June	Data Analysis	Data from first two reporting periods prepared for use at July data analysis meeting.
July-August	Data analysis and construction of draft continua of performance for these standards: <i>Read with Understanding, Convey Ideas in Writing, Listen Actively and Speak So Others Can Understand</i>	The EFF Assessment Consortium and field assistants met July 9-13, to begin the continua construction process, using data from field reports. The team practiced the behavioral anchoring process that will be used by the technical judging panels. Work continued through the end of August to finalize the standard-specific data templates and draft continua. Materials were prepared for review at the final project meeting.
September	Final project meeting, September 12-15, Portland, Oregon	Participants reviewed and revised the draft continua for four communications standards; evaluated the preliminary draft continua for the other six Standards and made recommendations for additional rounds of field work.

EFF Assessment Framework

Timetable for Process and Products 2000–04

DATE	PROCESS	PRODUCTS
2000	Field Research to Describe Performance on the EFF Standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define 4 dimensions of the EFF performance continuum • Generate performance tasks and collect data on adult learner performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 dimensions of the EFF performance continuum defined. • Preliminary picture of performance along each dimension of the continuum for ABE and ESL learners.
2001	Field Review and Analysis to Develop EFF Performance Continua <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop/refine performance continua for four Communication Standards. • Develop/refine performance continuum for <i>Use Math</i>. • Continue research to generate more data for remaining Standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft performance level descriptors for each of the 4 EFF Communication Standards and for <i>Use Math to Communicate and Solve Problems</i>. • Range of performance tasks for all 5 Standards. • Practitioners with increased expertise in standards-based teaching and assessment.
2002	Expert Review of Performance Continua (Phase 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panels of experts review performance continua for <i>Listen Actively, Speak So Others Can Understand</i>, and <i>Convey Ideas in Writing</i> • Panels of experts review performance continua for <i>Read With Understanding</i> and <i>Use Math to Solve Problems and Communicate</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised performance level descriptors for the knowledge base, fluency, independence, and range dimensions of the performance continua for these 3 Standards • Revised performance level descriptors for these 2 Standards
	Match EFF Performance Continua to NRS Levels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use results of content expert reviews of the 4 Communication Standards plus <i>Use Math</i> to draft EFF/NRS Educational Functioning Levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft EFF/NRS Educational Functioning Level Descriptors for 5 EFF Standards
November	Conduct Accountability Model Development Workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review EFF/NRS Level Descriptors and identify benchmarks for use in state assessment systems • Develop models for state assessment and reporting of educational gains using the EFF/NRS Level Descriptors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise EFF/NRS Level Descriptors • Draft specifications for assessment task, scoring rubrics, and reporting systems

(continued on page 34)

EFF Assessment Framework

Timetable for Process and Products 2000–04

DATE	PROCESS	PRODUCTS
2002 <i>continued</i>	Plan Phase 2 Expert Reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design for second round of content expert review panels
	Plan Task Development Institute (Phase 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of Task Development Institute
	Conduct Task Development Institute (Phase 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment tasks, scoring rubrics, and reporting guidelines for 4 EFF Communication Skills and <i>Use Math</i>
2003	Pilot Test Assessment, Scoring, and Reporting Tools for Phase 1 EFF/NRS Levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisions to assessment tasks, scoring rubrics, and reporting guidelines
	Develop Materials and Resources for Training and Technical Assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handbook and technical assistance resources
	Expert Review of Performance Continua (Phase 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised performance continua for selected Interpersonal, Decision-Making, and Lifelong Learning Skills Standards
	Distribute EFF Tools for Assessing and Reporting Education Gains on EFF/NRS Levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifications for assessment tasks, scoring rubrics, and reporting • Sample assessment tasks, scoring guidelines, and reporting forms
	Task Development Institute (Phase 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment tasks, scoring rubrics, and reporting guidelines for selected Interpersonal, Decision-Making, and Lifelong Learning Skills Standards
	Pilot Test Assessment, Scoring, and Reporting Tools for Phase 2 EFF/NRS Levels Update Materials and Resources for Training and Technical Assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisions to assessment tasks, scoring rubrics, and reporting guidelines • Revised handbook and technical assistance resources
2004 January	Distribute Phase 2 Tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifications • Sample tools and support materials

Equipped for the Future Assessment Consortium Technical Advisory Group

Sri Ananda

Program Director, Assessment
and Standards Development Services
WestEd

Stephen Reder

University Professor and Chair
Department of Applied Linguistics
Portland State University

Lynda Ginsburg

Senior Researcher
National Center on Adult Literacy
University of Pennsylvania

John Sabatini

Educational Researcher
University of Pennsylvania

Dorry M. Kenyon

Director, Language Testing Division
Center for Applied Linguistics

Chris Sager

Senior Researcher
HumRRO (Human Resources
Research Organization)

Equipped for the Future Assessment Consortium Staff

Center for Literacy Studies

University of Tennessee
600 Henley Street, Suite 312
Knoxville, TN 37996
865-974-4109
865-974-3857 (fax)

Brenda Bell
Consortium Co-Director
865-974-6654
bsbell@utk.edu

Gail Cope
Research Associate
865-974-1225
gcope@utk.edu

Aaron Kohring
Research Associate
865-974-4258
akohring@utk.edu

Peggy McGuire
Senior Research Associate
4947 Rubican Street
Philadelphia, PA 19144
215-843-8384 (ph/fax)
mcguirep555@aol.com

SRI International

333 Ravenswood Ave
Menlo Park, CA 94025
650-859-3375 (Fax)

Regie Stites, Consortium
Co-Director
650-859-3768
regie.stites@sri.com

Melanie Daniels
Research Analyst
Tel: 650-859-5805
melanie.daniels@sri.com

Nadine Duong
Nadine.duong@sri.com

Marilyn Gillespie
Educational Researcher
1611 North Kent St
Arlington, VA 22209
703-247-8510 (W)
(Fax) 703-247-8493
gillespie@wdc.sri.com

National Institute for Literacy

Sondra Stein, National Director
Equipped for the Future
National Institute for Literacy
1725 I Street, NW, #730
Washington, DC 20006-2401
202-233-2025 (office)
202-233-2050 (fax)
sstein@nifl.gov

Equipped for the Future Field Development Partners, 2000-01**MAINE**

Maine Department of Education
Marcia Cook

Center for Adult Learning and Literacy, U of Maine, Orono
Mary Schneckenburger

Field Assistant: Janet Smith

PROGRAMS

Dover Foxcroft-Milo Adult Education
Shirley Wright, Director
Diane Curran
Anita Johndro
Edith Miles

Franklin County Adult Basic Education
Raymond Therrien, Director
Susan Kelley
Janet Smith

Massabesic Adult and Community Education
Barbara Goodwin, Director
Keith Dawson
Michael DeAngelis

MSAD # 27 Adult Education
Peter Caron, Director
Mary Ouellette

MSAD # 49 Adult and Community Education
Patricia Theriault, Director
James Chapman
Alverta Dyar-Goodrich

Noble Adult and Community Education
Brenda Gagne, Director
Louise Burns
Jill Hofmeister

OHIO

Ohio Department of Education
Jim Bowling and Denise Pottmeyer

Ohio Literacy Resource Center
Judy Franks

Center on Education and Training for Employment
Cindy Zengler and Lynn Reese

Field Assistants: Kathy Petrek and Sharon Ketterheinrich

PROGRAMS
Canton City Schools ABLE
Jane Meyer, Coordinator
Martha Hyland, Coordinator
Stephanie Reinhart
Debbie Stowers
Dana Tomcsak

Columbiana County Career Center
Michael Morris, Coordinator
Andrea Copestick
Laura Joan Wagner

Hamilton City ABLE
Kathy Petrek, Coordinator
Tawna Eubanks
Sharon Katterheinrich
Millie Kuth

Ravenna Even Start
Odessa Pinkard
Susana Barba
Meg Kuyon
Lory Vild

South Western City Schools
Gail Morgan, Administrator
Candy Bettinger
Karen Hibbert
Ruth Knisely
Sharon Trouten

OREGON

Oregon Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development
Sharlene Walker, Kristen Kulongoski and Cathy Lindsley

Field Assistants: Joan Benz (deceased); Mary Foust

PROGRAMS
Central Oregon Community College
Janet Rippy, Administrator
Catherine Lund
Melissa Potter
Dicksy Scott

Chemeketa Community College
Susan Fish, Administrator
Kay Gerard
Monica Salgado
Virginia Tardaewether

Clackamas Community College
Rene Zingarelli
Linda Durham
Kathleen Fallon
Alice Goldstein

Department of Corrections
Julie Kopet, Administrator
Tom Gregson
Judy Heumann
Janice Ruhl

Lane Community College
Dennis Clark, Administrator
Mary Foust
Mary Gilroy
Cathy Russell

Equipped for the Future Field Development Partners, 2000-01**TENNESSEE****Department of Labor and
Workforce Development**

Phil White and Hope Lancaster

Center for Literacy Studies

Connie White and Jean Stephens

Field Assistant: Aaron Kohring

PROGRAMS**Greeneville City AE Program**

Kim Gass, Supervisor

Joyce Hopson

Knox County Adult Literacy

Jane Knight, Adult Literacy

Coordinator

Ellie Gardner

Emily McDonald-Littleton

Mary Norris

Putnam County AE Program

Lynda Breeden

Kathy Howard

Mary Jeanne Maples

Jimmie Webber

WASHINGTON**Washington State Board for
Community Colleges**

Israel Mendoza and Brian Kanes

ABLE Network

Meg Connelly

Cynthia Gaede

Field Assistant: Joan Allen

PROGRAMS**Bates Technical College**

Jacquie Banks

Robin Stanton

Brandi Cockrell

Nancy Gepke

Big Bend Community College

Terry Kinzel, Families That Work

Director

Sandy Cheek

Becky Jones

Elizabeth Nelson

Nancy Villarreal

Valerie Wade

Community Colleges of Spokane

Molly Popchock, Program

Administrator

Sabina Herdrich

Katherine Laise

Karen Snell

Marianne Steen

Seattle Central**Community College**

Andre Loh, Administrator

Rebecca Boone

Colleen Comidy

Joanna Elizondo

Josefina Saldin

Wenatchee Valley**Community College**

Adrienne Tabar

Erin Cass

Paula Jaramillo

Peter Prehn

Agreement Forms – EFF/NRS Project 2001-02

For Teachers

I have read the project description and participant responsibilities and I agree to:

- attend initial training that will prepare me to plan and describe well-constructed learning tasks; document observations of performance; and use the data collection/reporting tools;
- spend six to ten hours per week in EFF-friendly instructional planning, teaching, and documenting/reporting on at least two standards (see my choices below);
- meet with EFF team members in my program on a regular basis (at least bi-weekly) to collaborate on establishing rankings for tasks and performances, and share challenges, ideas, resources and accomplishments;
- take advantage of opportunities to receive technical assistance from EFF field development staff, including site visits and participation in two statewide or regional technical assistance sessions through the year;
- attend two national meetings of field development partners;
- submit required reports and documentation in format requested (computer disk) and in a timely manner;
- ask for help when needed; and
- inform the project staff promptly if there are any changes in teaching circumstances that prevent or hinder the implementation of the work as outlined above.

Plans

I plan to work with the following group of students or class: (please describe educational level and type of class or group of students)

I would like to focus on the following
Communication Standard:

First choice: _____

Second choice: _____

The other Standard(s) I would like
to focus on are:

First choice: _____

Second choice: _____

Payment for Teachers: I understand that I will receive an honorarium for my participation in this project, and that the honorarium amount is not meant to be a direct reimbursement for each hour spent on work associated with the project. I understand that the national EFF management has recommended a stipend of \$2,000 to \$2,500 per teacher and that the final decision about the amount of the honorarium will be made by the state office of adult education, which is providing the honorarium. Expenses associated with the initial in-state training and subsequent state meetings of field sites will be covered by the state agency.

For Program Administrators:

I have read the project description and participant responsibilities and I agree to:

- support a team, consisting of three to four instructors and myself, in our involvement in the phase three field development process;
- assure that members of the team meet regularly and work collaboratively as much as possible to accomplish the goals of the EFF Phase 3 field development initiative;
- attend all training and technical assistance sessions, including state or regional and national meetings;
- observe instructional and documentation activities of the teachers;
- observe the effects of EFF implementation in my program;
- convene and actively participate in regular team meetings;
- encourage other professional development opportunities such as teacher cross-visitation/observation;
- take advantage of opportunities to receive technical assistance from EFF field development staff through site visits and meetings;
- insure that teacher reports and supporting documentation are completed and submitted on time;
- submit reports in format requested (computer disk) and in a timely manner.
- inform project staff promptly if there are any changes in the program's ability to participate in the project;
- manage the grant from the state agency that will provide stipends to participating teachers; and
- keep state agency contacts informed about the work.

Time Frame

October, 2000 through June, 2001, with a national debriefing meeting in September, 2001; see attached time table.

Equipped for the Future, through its grantee, the Center for Literacy Studies at the University of Tennessee, will pay for travel, lodging and meals for two national meetings (February and September).

Agreed:

Practitioner/Administrator

Program Director/State Agency Director

Date

Date

Social Security Number**For State Agency Directors:**

I have read the project description and participant responsibilities and I agree that I or my designated representative will:

- identify four to six programs in this state to participate in this project;
- commit to providing financial support to each of these field sites for their participation in meetings (two statewide site meetings), and for planning and documentation (a stipend of \$6,000 - \$10,000 per program site, or the equivalent of \$2,000 - \$2,500 per practitioner researcher)
- ensure that the field sites collectively represent a range of ABE (beginning, intermediate, ASE) and ESOL (beginning, intermediate, advanced) learners, unless otherwise negotiated with the EFF staff;
- keep well informed about what is happening in the field development process—by attending all trainings and meetings or by sending representatives
- think about how to integrate what is happening with EFF field development into the ongoing work of the statewide adult basic education system;
- make sure that three to four instructors and one administrator at each program are actively involved in field research/documentation, and are available for initial training, two state-wide/regional technical assistance sessions, on-site technical assistance, and two national meeting of pilot programs; and
- coordinate arrangements for initial in-state training and statewide/regional technical assistance sessions, both internally and with the EFF Assessment Coordinator who will also attend the meetings.

Expenses: Expenses associated with the initial in-state training and subsequent state meetings of field sites will be covered by the state agency. Equipped for the Future, through its grantee, the Center for Literacy Studies at the University of Tennessee, will pay for travel, lodging and meals for all participants for two national meetings (February and September), and technical assistance and support.

Agreed:

State Director of Adult Education

Equipped for the Future Director

Date

Date

Outcome Measures Definitions

Educational Functioning Level Descriptors — Adult Basic Education Levels

Literacy Level	Basic Reading and Writing	Numeracy Skills	Functional and Workplace Skills
BEGINNING ABE LITERACY <i>Test Benchmark:</i> TABLE (5-6) scale scores (grade level 0-1.9): Total reading 529 and below Total math 540 and below Total language 599 and below TABLE (7-8) scale scores (grade level 0-1.9): Reading 367 and below Total Math 313 and below Language 391 and below CASAS: 200 and below AMES (B, ABE) scale scores (grade level 0-1.9): Reading: 500 and below Total Math: 476 and below Communication: 496 and below ABLE scale scores (grade level 0-1.9): Reading 523 and below Math 521 and below	Individual has no or minimal reading and writing skills. May have little or no comprehension of how print corresponds to spoken language and may have difficulty using a writing instrument. At the upper range of this level, individual can recognize, read and write letters and numbers, but has a limited understanding of connected prose and may need frequent re-reading. Can write a limited number of basic sight words and familiar words and phrases; may also be able to write simple sentences or phrases, including very simple messages. Can write basic personal information. Narrative writing is disorganized and unclear; inconsistently uses simple punctuation (e.g., periods, commas, question marks); contains frequent errors in spelling.	Individual has little or no recognition of numbers or simple counting skills or may have only minimal skills, such as the ability to add or subtract single digit numbers.	Individual has little or no ability to read basic signs or maps, can provide limited personal information on simple forms. The individual can handle routine entry level jobs that require little or no basic written communication or computational skills and no knowledge of computers or other technology.
BEGINNING BASIC EDUCATION <i>Test Benchmark:</i> TABLE (5-6) scale scores (grade level 2-3.9): Total reading 530-679 Total math 541-677 Total language 600-677 TABLE (7-8) scale scores (grade level 2-3.9): Reading: 368-460 Total Math: 314-441 Language: 392-490 CASAS: 201-210 AMES (B, ABE) scale scores (grade level 2-3.9): Reading: 503-510 Total Math: 477-492 Communication: 498-506 ABLE scale scores (grade level 2-3.9): Reading: 525-612 Math: 530-591	Individual can read simple material on familiar subjects and comprehend simple and compound sentences in single or linked paragraphs containing a familiar vocabulary; can write simple notes and messages on familiar situations, but lacks clarity and focus. Sentence structure lacks variety, but shows some control of basic grammar (e.g., present and past tense), and consistent use of punctuation (e.g., periods, capitalization).	Individual can count, add and subtract three digit numbers, can perform multiplication through 12; can identify simple fractions and perform other simple arithmetic operations.	Individual is able to read simple directions, signs and maps, fill out simple forms requiring basic personal information, write phone messages and make simple change. There is minimal knowledge of, and experience with, using computers and related technology. The individual can handle basic entry level jobs that require minimal literacy skills; can recognize very short, explicit, pictorial texts, e.g., understands logos related to worker safety before using a piece of machinery; can read want ads and complete simple job applications.

Outcome Measures Definitions

Educational Functioning Level Descriptors — Adult Basic Education Levels

Literacy Level	Basic Reading and Writing	Numeracy Skills	Functional and Workplace Skills
LOW INTERMEDIATE BASIC EDUCATION <i>Test benchmark:</i> TABLE (5-6) scale scores (grade level 4-5.9): Total reading: 680-722 Total math: 678-729 Total language: 678-705 TABLE (7-8) scale scores (grade level 4-5.9): Reading: 461-517 Total Math: 442-505 Language: 491-523 CASAS: 211-220 AMES (B and C, ABE) scale scores (grade level 4-5.9): Reading (B): 511-609 Reading (C): 514-521 Total Math (B): 494-603 Total Math (C): 493-508 Communication (B): 508-605, (C) 509-513 ABLE scale scores (grade level 4-5.9): Reading: 613-644 Math: 593-641	Individual can read text on familiar subjects that have a simple and clear underlying structure (e.g., clear main idea, chronological order); can use context to determine meaning; can interpret actions required in specific written directions, can write simple paragraphs with main idea and supporting detail on familiar topics (e.g., daily activities, personal issues) by recombining learned vocabulary and structures; can self and peer edit for spelling and punctuation errors.	Individual can perform with high accuracy all four basic math operations using whole numbers up to three digits; can identify and use all basic mathematical symbols. Individual is able to handle basic reading, writing and computational tasks related to life roles, such as completing medical forms, order forms or job applications; can read simple charts, graphs labels and payroll stubs and simple authentic material if familiar with the topic. The individual can use simple computer programs and perform a sequence of routine tasks given direction using technology (e.g., fax machine, computer operation).	The individual can qualify for entry level jobs that require following basic written instructions and diagrams with assistance, such as oral clarification; can write a short report or message to fellow workers; can read simple dials and scales and take routine measurements.
HIGH INTERMEDIATE BASIC EDUCATION <i>Test benchmark:</i> TABLE (5-6) scale scores (grade level 6-8.9): Total reading: 723-761 Total math: 730-776 Total language: 706-730 TABLE (7-8) scale scores (grade level 6-8.9): Reading: 518-566 Total Math: 506-565 Language: 524-559 CASAS: 221-235 AMES (C and D, ABE) scale scores (grade level 6-8.9): Reading (C): 525-612 Reading (D): 522-543 Total Math (C): 510-627 Total Math (D): 509-532 Communication (C): 516-611 Communication (D): 516-523 ABLE scale score (grade level 6-8.9): Reading: 646-680 Math: 643-693	Individual is able to read simple descriptions and narratives on familiar subjects or from which new vocabulary can be determined by context; can make some minimal inferences about familiar texts and compare and contrast information from such texts, but not consistently. The individual can write simple narrative descriptions and short essays on familiar topics; has consistent use of basic punctuation, but makes grammatical errors with complex structures.	Individual can perform all four basic math operations with whole numbers and fractions; can determine correct math operations for solving narrative math problems and can convert fractions to decimals and decimals to fractions; can perform basic operations on fractions.	Individual is able to handle basic life skills tasks such as graphs, charts and labels, and can follow multi-step diagrams; can read authentic materials on familiar topics, such as simple employee handbooks and payroll stubs; can complete forms such as a job application and reconcile a bank statement. Can handle jobs that involves following simple written instructions and diagrams; can read procedural texts, where the information is supported by diagrams, to remedy a problem, such as locating a problem with a machine or carrying out repairs using a repair manual. The individual can learn or work with most basic computer software, such as using a word processor to produce own texts; can follow simple instructions for using technology.

Outcome Measures Definitions

Educational Functioning Level Descriptors — Adult Basic Education Levels

Literacy Level	Basic Reading and Writing	Numeracy Skills	Functional and Workplace Skills
LOW ADULT SECONDARY EDUCATION <i>Test benchmark:</i> TABLE (5-6) scale scores (grade level 9-10.9): Total reading: 762-775 Total math: 777-789 Total language 731-743 TABLE (7-8): scale scores (grade level 9-10.9): Reading: 567-595 Total Math: 566-594 Language: 560-585 CASAS: 236-245 AMES (E, ABE) scale scores (grade level 9-10.9): Reading: 544-561 Total Math: 534-548 Communication: 527-535 ABLE scale scores (grade level 9-10.9): Reading: 682-697 Math: 694-716	Individual can comprehend expository writing and identify spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors; can comprehend a variety of materials such as periodicals and non-technical journals on common topics; can comprehend library reference materials and compose multi-paragraph essays; can listen to oral instructions and write an accurate synthesis of them; can identify the main idea in reading selections and use a variety of context issues to determine meaning. Writing is organized and cohesive with few mechanical errors; can write using a complex sentence structure; can write personal notes and letters that accurately reflect thoughts.	Individual can perform all basic math functions with whole numbers, decimals and fractions; can interpret and solve simple algebraic equations, tables and graphs and can develop own tables and graphs; can use math in business transactions.	Individual is able or can learn to follow simple multi-step directions, and read common legal forms and manuals; can integrate information from texts, charts and graphs; can create and use tables and graphs; can complete forms and applications and complete resumes; can perform jobs that require interpreting information from various sources and writing or explaining tasks to other workers; is proficient using computers and can use most common computer applications; can understand the impact of using different technologies; can interpret the appropriate use of new software and technology.
HIGH ADULT SECONDARY EDUCATION <i>Test benchmark:</i> TABLE (5-6) scale scores (grade level 11-12.9): Total reading: 776 and above Total math: 790 and above Total language: 744 and above TABLE (7-8): scale scores (grade level 11-12): Reading: 596 and above Total Math: 595 and above Language: 586 and above CASAS: 246 and higher AMES (E, ABE) scale scores (grade level 11-12): Reading: 565 and above Total Math: 551 and above Communication: 538 and above ABLE scale scores (grade level 11-12): Reading: 699 and above Math: 717 and above	Individual can comprehend, explain and analyze information from a variety of literacy works, including primary source materials and professional journals; can use context cues and higher order processes to interpret meaning of written material. Writing is cohesive with clearly expressed ideas supported by relevant detail; can use varied and complex sentence structures with few mechanical errors.	Individual can make mathematical estimates of time and space and can apply principles of geometry to measure angles, lines and surfaces; can also apply trigonometric functions.	Individuals are able to read technical information and complex manuals; can comprehend some college level books and apprenticeship manuals; can function in most job situations involving higher order thinking; can read text and explain a procedure about a complex and unfamiliar work procedure, such as operating a complex piece of machinery; can evaluate new work situations and processes; can work productively and collaboratively in groups and serve as facilitator and reporter of group work. The individual is able to use common software and learn new software applications; can define the purpose of new technology and software and select appropriate technology; can adapt use of software or technology to new situations and can instruct others, in written or oral form on software and technology use.

Outcome Measures Definitions

Educational Functioning Level Descriptors — English as a Second Language Levels

Literacy Level	Speaking and Listing	Basic Reading and Writing	Functional and Workplace Skills
BEGINNING ESL LITERACY <i>Test benchmark:</i> CASAS (Life Skills): 180 and below SPL (Speaking) 0-1 SPL (Reading and Writing) 0-1 Oral BEST: 0-15 Literacy BEST: 0-7	Individual cannot speak or understand English, or understands only isolated words or phrases.	Individual has no or minimal reading or writing skills in any language. May have little or no comprehension of how print corresponds to spoken language and may have difficulty using a writing instrument.	Individual functions minimally or not at all in English and can communicate only through gestures or a few isolated words, such as name and other personal information; may recognize only common signs or symbols (e.g., stop sign, product logos); can handle only very routine entry-level jobs that do not require oral or written communication in English. There is no knowledge or use of computers or technology.
BEGINNING ESL <i>Test benchmark:</i> CASAS (Life Skills): 181-200 SPL (Speaking) 2-3 SPL (Reading and Writing) 2-4 Oral BEST 16-41 Literacy BEST: 8-46	Individual can understand frequently used words in context and very simple phrases spoken slowly and with some repetition; there is little communicative output and only in the most routine situations; little or no control over basic grammar; survival needs can be communicated simply, and there is some understanding of simple questions.	Individual can recognize, read and write numbers and letters, but has a limited understanding of connected prose and may need frequent re-reading; can write a limited number of basic sight words and familiar words and phrases; may also be able to write simple sentences or phrases, including very simple messages. Can write basic personal information. Narrative writing is disorganized and unclear; inconsistently uses simple punctuation (e.g., periods, commas, question marks); contains frequent errors in spelling.	Individual functions with difficulty in situations related to immediate needs and in limited social situations; has some simple oral communication abilities using simple learned and repeated phrases; may need frequent repetition; can provide personal information on simple forms; can recognize common forms of print found in the home and environment, such as labels and product names; can handle routine entry level jobs that require only the most basic written or oral English communication and in which job tasks can be demonstrated. There is minimal knowledge or experience using computers or technology.
LOW INTERMEDIATE ESL <i>Test benchmark:</i> CASAS (Life Skills): 201-210 SPL (Speaking) 4 SPL (Reading and Writing) 5 Oral BEST: 42-50 Literacy BEST: 47-53	Individual can understand simple learned phrases and limited new phrases containing familiar vocabulary spoken slowly with frequent repetition; can ask and respond to questions using such phrases; can express basic survival needs and participate in some routine social conversations, although with some difficulty; has some control of basic grammar.	Individual can read simple material on familiar subjects and comprehend simple and compound sentences in single or linked paragraphs containing a familiar vocabulary; can write simple notes and messages on familiar situations, but lacks clarity and focus. Sentence structure lacks variety, but shows some control of basic grammar (e.g., present and past tense), and consistent use of punctuation (e.g., periods, capitalization).	Individual can interpret simple directions and schedules, signs and maps; can fill out simple forms, but needs support on some documents that are not simplified; can handle routine entry level jobs that involve some written or oral English communication, but in which job tasks can be demonstrated. Individual can use simple computer programs and can perform a sequence of routine tasks given directions using technology (e.g., fax machine, computer).

Outcome Measures Definitions

Educational Functioning Level Descriptors — English as a Second Language Levels

Literacy Level	Speaking and Listing	Basic Reading and Writing	Functional and Workplace Skills
HIGH INTERMEDIATE ESL <i>Test benchmark:</i> CASAS (Life Skills): 211-220 SPL (Speaking) 5 SPL (Reading and Writing) 6 Oral BEST: 51-57 Literacy BEST: 54-65	Individual can understand learned phrases and short new phrases containing familiar vocabulary spoken slowly and with some repetition; can communicate basic survival needs with some help; can participate in conversation in limited social situations and use new phrases with hesitation; relies on description and concrete terms. There is inconsistent control of more complex grammar.	Individual can read text on familiar subjects that have a simple and clear underlying structure (e.g., clear main idea, chronological order); can use context to determine meaning; can interpret actions required in specific written directions; can write simple paragraphs with main idea and supporting detail on familiar topics (e.g., daily activities, personal issues) by recombining learned vocabulary and structures; can self and peer edit for spelling and punctuation errors.	Individual can meet basic survival and social needs, can follow some simple oral and written instruction and has some ability to communicate on the telephone on familiar subjects; can write messages and notes related to basic needs; complete basic medical forms and job applications; can handle jobs that involve basic oral instructions and written communication in tasks that can be clarified orally. The individual can work with or learn basic computer software, such as word processing; can follow simple instructions for using technology.
LOW ADVANCED ESL <i>Test benchmark:</i> CASAS (Life Skills): 221-235 SPL (Speaking) 6 SPL (Reading and Writing) 7 Oral BEST 58-64 Literacy BEST: 66 and above	Individual can converse on many everyday subjects and some subjects with unfamiliar vocabulary, but may need repetition, rewording or slower speech; can speak creatively, but with hesitation; can clarify general meaning by rewording and has control of basic grammar; understands descriptive and spoken narrative and can comprehend abstract concepts in familiar contexts.	Individual is able to read simple descriptions and narratives on familiar subjects or from which new vocabulary can be determined by context; can make some minimal inferences about familiar texts and compare and contrast information from such texts, but not consistently. The individual can write simple narrative descriptions and short essays on familiar topics, such as customs in native country; has consistent use of basic punctuation, but makes grammatical errors with complex structures.	Individual can function independently to meet most survival needs and can communicate on the telephone on familiar topics; can interpret simple charts and graphics; can handle jobs that require simple oral and written instructions, multi-step diagrams and limited public interaction. The individual can use all basic software applications, understand the impact of technology and select the correct technology in a new situation.
HIGH ADVANCED ESL <i>Test benchmark:</i> CASAS (Life Skills): 236-245 SPL (Speaking) 7 SPL (Reading and Writing) 8 Oral BEST 65 and above	Individual can understand and participate effectively in face-to-face conversations on everyday subjects spoken at normal speed; can converse and understand independently in survival, work and social situations; can expand on basic ideas in conversations, but with some hesitation; can clarify general meaning and control basic grammar, although still lacks total control over complex structures.	Individual can read authentic materials on everyday subjects and can handle most reading related to life roles; can consistently and fully interpret descriptive narratives on familiar topics and gain meaning from unfamiliar topics; uses increased control of language and meaning-making strategies to gain meaning of unfamiliar texts. The individual can write multiparagraph essays with a clear introduction and development of ideas; writing contains well formed sentences, appropriate mechanics and spelling, and few grammatical errors.	Individual has a general ability to use English effectively to meet most routine social and work situations; can interpret routine charts, graphs and tables and complete forms; has high ability to communicate on the telephone and understand radio and television; can meet work demands that require reading and writing and can interact with the public. The individual can use common software and learn new applications; can define the purpose of software and select new applications appropriately; can instruct others in use of software and technology.